



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	<u>Ophthalmology Research: An international Journal</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_OR_3614
Title of the Manuscript:	Reliability and Comparison of Corneal Reflex Measurement with Plusoptix S08 in Nonstrabismic Amblyopic Children

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>

- This form has total 7 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	There are numerous spelling and grammatical errors. I have suspicions about the homogeneity of the groups. It is hard to accept this study as a controlled one. Although cycloplegic retinoscopy is the gold standard for refractive error measurement, there is not any results of refractive examination in the groups. The authors do not mention about the results of ophthalmological examination (visual acuity, strabismus, etc). Pupillary diameter could significantly affect the results. The authors do not mention about this. The presentation of the results are cursory. The authors should answer why should the corneal reflex value be a reliable screening tool. There are lots of manuscript determinig that PlusOptix is not a reliable tool for screening of amblyopia. The authors do not mention about these. Discussion is not focusing on the purpose of the study. The factors that could affect the corneal reflex values are not discussed. Explication of the results are not satisfactory.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Note: Anonymous Reviewer